Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 25 Feb 93   Volume 93 : Issue   49

Today's Topics:
          Congress Orders FCC to Study Security For Cellphones
                      Intellect of readers & Sarcasm

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1993 17:33:45 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!unixg.ubc.ca!kakwa.ucs.ualberta.ca!ersys!ve6mgs!rec-radio-
info@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Congress Orders FCC to Study Security For Cellphones
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[Reposted from comp.dcom.telecom]

When congress ordered the FCC to deny type-approval to "scanning
receivers" that can receive cellular phone frequencies, they also
ordered a study. The law reads:

        "The commission shall report to congress no later than June 1,
1993, on available security features for both analog and digital radio
signals. This report shall include a study of security technologies
already available as well as those in development. The study shall
assess the capabilities of such technologies, level of security
afforded, and clost, with wide-spread deployment of such technologies"
(P.L. 102-556 Sec. 403 (b)).

This is the chance to lobby for fully encrypted cellular
telephony.

John Nagle
--
  - Postings to rec.radio.info: rec-radio-info@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca
  - rec.radio.info administrivia: rec-radio-request@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca

----

Date: 24 Feb 93 09:09:09 GMT
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!yale.edu!ira.uka.de!math.fu-berlin.de!news.netmbx.de!
Germany.EU.net!mcsun!uknet!uos-ee!ee.surrey.ac.uk!M.Willis@ames.arpa
Subject: Intellect of readers & Sarcasm
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Perhaps all the readers of this group are of high intelligence, but they are
certainly not all native English speakers. One may expect sarcasm to be missed if
you are not a native speaker of the language that is being sarcastic.

Mike

Date: 24 Feb 93 09:03:35 GMT
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!yale.edu!ira.uka.de!math.fu-berlin.de!news.netmbx.de!
Germany.EU.net!mcsun!uknet!uos-ee!ee.surrey.ac.uk!M.Willis@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <14600044@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com>, <103380022@hpfcso.FC.HP.COM>,
<1lvrc3$f4a@agate.berkeley.edu>x.de
Subject : Re: Eliminate the Written Exam

In article <1lvrc3$f4a@agate.berkeley.edu>, lee@soda.berkeley.edu (Lee Thompson-
Herbert) writes:
|> In article <103380022@hpfcso.FC.HP.COM> perry@hpfcso.FC.HP.COM (Perry Scott)
writes:
|> >

|>
|> Wonderful. Morse is easier *if* you're not dyslexic.
|> I have yet to have _heard_ of a Morse waiver for dyslexics, even though
|> CW is *far* more difficult for a dyslexic than it is for someone who's
|> motion-impared. The quadraplegic may not be able to write or to send,
|> but at least he can *understand* it. The dyslexic may not be able to
|> receive, because the letters come in one-at-a-time, instead of in word-

```
|> sized chunks...and consequently it makes no sense at all, even if he
|> writes it down.
|>
|> CW is easy if _and_only_if_ the student can read and write at the
|> neccesary speed.  And one-letter-at-a-time is _significantly_ harder
|> than word-at-a-time processing.
|>
```

Hang on a minute. If the persone can not understand CW for whatever reason then
they should not be on HF. The reason for the CW test is so that you can be asked
to
QSY if you are causing interference to another service. This is really only likely
on shared bands.

I had great difficulty learning CW as I keep on getting letters mixed up, I have
the same problem in writing and reading, spell checkers are a godsend.

Answer this, is it right to allow a blind person to drive because though they can
not pass the sight test but the ban would discriminate against the disabled?

Until the international code requirement is dropped there is no way to get onto HF
without proficiency in it. Nor should there be, law is law.

What there is an argument against is CODE requirements for exclusive bands, and
code for incentive licencing. To be extra you should be very good at radio theory,
not just good at morse code. By good I mean at graduate level, not with a degree,
just as good as you could reasonably expect a new graduate to be if there was a
course in amateur radio. This may take the average amateur ten years to achieve
but
then that is what it is all about.

Mike

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #49
****